# LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

## Unemployment Warning

by Sir Richard Coppock, general secretary of the National Federation of Building Trades Operatives

★

## Strike Strategy

R. Palme Dutt reviews current struggles

*Other Articles include*

**ASCENT TO THE SUMMIT**
by Ivor Montagu

**STRIJDOM'S 'TRIUMPH'**
by E. S. Sachs

**SCIENTISTS AND NUCLEAR ARMS**
by Dr. E. H. S. Burhop

**ELECTION PICTURE**
by Councillor Tommy Richardson

JUNE · 1958

ONE SHILLING AND SIXPENCE

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# STRONGHOLD

FOR A NATIVE of the borders of the warm, brown Bristol Channel of Somerset and Gloucester it is a long step to the cold, grey North Sea coast of Durham and Northumberland. But what a vivid impression it makes on anyone paying a first visit to the bleak north-east, as I have just done. A country that shows the hard bone, sinew and muscle of Britain. A landscape whose fruit is coal, iron and steel; whose timber is a forest of derricks, cranes, pithead wheels, coal tips. Those three great rivers, the Tees, the Wear and the 'coaly Tyne', which have seen built and launched so many thousands of ships; on whose waters were borne the materials to build St. Paul's. That first coalfield, whose exploitation marked capitalism's main start, whence the 'sea coal' came by coastwise shipping to the Elizabethan court, and provided the promising young dramatist Will Shakespeare with not a few topical jests. By the same route today come the collier 'little ships' which keep London in light and power. In the Great Freeze-up of 1947, when the lights of London nearly went out, Londoners learnt to regard them as heroes. (Even the millionaire press sent journalists down to the riverside to 'get the story' of their arrival, which—for once—became 'news'. In contrast to Fleet Street's momentary patronage, what warmth I witnessed when the stevedores and canteen workers on the coal wharves welcomed the weary and frozen Geordies.) That same coalfield of the North-East saw the first great strike struggle of 200 years ago, when they hadn't so much as thought of opening up the pits in a country like the U.S. How much there is to learn, listening to stories from these Tynesiders, despite vowels, consonants and lilt altogether strange and wonderful to west country ears. Then, for the first time to come upon the city of Durham, with its feudal castle of a cathedral, covering the steep wooded island in the Wear. An astounding structure, built 800 years ago in only 40 years, and challenging comparison with that in any country this journal reaches. Beside this feudal stronghold, built to strike terror and dominate invading Scot and turbulent serf alike, you catch yourself trembling: you have failed to bring your tithe for the remorseless Bishop-princes who once ruled it. As final shock and contrast, you find in this vast monument and museum of the Normans and Plantagenets a memorial which bids you in blunt words: 'Remember before God the Durham miners who have given their lives in the pits of this country and those who work in darkness and danger in those pits today.'

Today, at least one man in the pits of Britain will lose his life. This month, 150 men will be injured.

I met some of 'those who work in darkness and danger', from lively youngsters to older men who find each shift harder to work than the last. Some were L.M. readers; others were still waiting to be convinced that they could find it of use in their struggle to change their conditions. (To some I told this story from another coalfield: A new miner reader quoting from his L.M., wiped the floor with a Workers Educational Association tutor, lecturing on wages policy, who had asserted that coal costs were pricing British exports out of the market.) Grandsons of men who after generations of grim struggle made this North-East a Labour stronghold, spoke of nationalisation, its weaknesses, possible

*(Continued on page iii of cover)*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NOTES OF THE MONTH

## 1. *Strike Strategy?*

LAST month we wrote of 'May Day Signs of Battle'. On May 5 the battle opened, with the London busmen in the front line. The busmen in their vanguard fight have enjoyed abundant moral support and some material support from other sections. But, in the initial phase at any rate, they have had to face alone the massed offensive of the Government and of the entire strength of the capitalist class, without allies in the field, without common action of the railwaymen (equally under attack from the Government, equally denied redress of their just claims, equally suffering from lowered real wages and standards) or of other sections.

This is a serious situation. A grimly, desperately serious situation, if it were to be the last word on the present state of the labour movement. It would be premature to attempt to deliver a final judgment on the details of a battle or a campaign, moving with new events day by day, in the pages of a monthly journal whose comment can only be read a fortnight after the event, when the situation may have radically changed. Nevertheless, on this first showing, this much must be said. The present busmen's battle is the first round in the new era of indus-

CONTENTS

JUNE · 1958


| | Page |
|---|---|
| NOTES OF THE MONTH: 1. *Strike Strategy?* 2. *Class and Party*, by R.P.D. ... ... ... | 241 |
| BRITAIN AND THE COLONIES. Discussion Conference Announcement ... ... ... ... | 258 |
| UNEMPLOYMENT WARNING, by Sir Richard Coppock ... ... | 260 |
| ASCENT TO THE SUMMIT, by Ivor Montagu ... ... ... | 263 |
| STRIJDOM'S 'TRIUMPH', by E. S. Sachs ... ... ... ... | 272 |
| SCIENTISTS AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS, by Dr. E. H. S. Burhop ... ... ... | 279 |
| LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM, 'A Brixton Reader'; Hugo Rathbone ... ... ... ... | 283 |
| AN ELECTION PEN-PICTURE, by Councillor Tommy Richardson | 286 |
| ILLUSTRATION FROM MEXICO, by A. Garcia Bustos ... | 264-265 |
| TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO ... | 288 |


The woodcuts of the Stralsund Shipyard in our May issue were done by Albert Herold, an artist of the German Democratic Republic.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trial conflicts, within the context of a worsening economic situation, which is replacing the soft illusions of the preceding period and compelling the recognition of the realities of class confrontation and the measure of class forces. Last month we wrote of 'Preparedness and the Labour Movement'. Every word stands.

The experience of this first phase of the fight is carrying the most grave and urgent lessons. These lessons require the attention of every section of the trade union and labour movement, if we are not to suffer in the final operation of events the repetition of an even more shameful and scandalous outcome than Black Friday or the betrayal of the general strike. There is no need of such an outcome. As we shall have occasion to see, the strength, the potential strength of the working class in Britain is far higher today than it has ever been. But that strength needs to be mobilised, united, led with some sense of strategy, not dispersed and thrown away and made the plaything of the Government's strategy.

**Showdown—Last Time**

There has been much talk of a 'showdown' to describe the present new sharpness of relations between the Government and the trade unions. The term is not incorrect. It is true. But the term is often too loosely used as a mere rhetorical phrase to describe any moment of conflict or dispute. **The real significance goes deeper.** During the upsurge after the first world war the Government in Britain, as in all the Western countries where the impulse of the working class under the inspiration of the Russian Revolution to challenge the old social order was strong, had to practise for a period a system to make concessions to the working class (the Social Democratic Government in Germany even put up lying posters 'Socialism is Here!') and was chary to risk a head-on collision. The 1919 rail strike taught Lloyd George that lesson. So did the Councils of Action in 1920. It was two and a half years then before the showdown began.

**From 1921 to 1926**

The capitalists were biding their time to launch their offensive. As soon as, with the winter of 1920-21, the economic situation took a downward turn and the chronic depression of inter-war Britain began, the full offensive was launched. The spearhead was first turned against the miners. Black Friday in 1921 saw the let-down of the miners by the other partners of the Triple Alliance, the railwaymen and transport workers. There followed the engineering lock-out of 1922. This was the beginning of the showdown. It

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ushered in a period of sharpening industrial struggles against the capitalist offensive, and the revival of solidarity thanks to the role of the newly formed Communist Party and the Minority Movement, culminating in Red Friday in 1925. Then came the shameful betrayal of preparedness by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress during the critical nine months while the Government was openly mobilising for all-out battle, with the arrest of the Communist leaders in the autumn of 1925 as a pivotal part of the Government's preparations. On this basis took place the deliberate provocation of the general strike in 1926 (with the principal Communist leaders in prison), engineered in order to smash the deadly menace of united action of the working class while the reformist leadership was still safely in the saddle and could be counted on to destroy it from within. This was the end of the showdown. Once the triumphant united action and solidarity of the workers had been broken, not by the strength of the Government or the capitalists, but by the deliberate treachery of the reformist leaders fearing revolution, there followed the general onslaught, the victimisation of the militant workers, the vengeance legislation of the Trade Union Act, and all the shameful years of acceptance of industrial servitude during the ensuing decade of the 'thirties whose sufferings have remained as a searing memory in the heart of the working class.

**Second Era of Illusions**

This time the period of concessions and kidglove methods in face of the upsurge of the workers has been longer. The advance of the socialist revolution over one-third of the world has far exceeded 1917. World capitalism is weaker. The increase in working class organised strength in the conservative capitalist countries where the socialist revolution has not yet taken place has been greater. It required a Labour Government for six years to hold the workers in check, first with the handing out of social reforms and concessions as a substitute for socialism, then, after the first fervour had passed, with austerity and calls for the wage freeze, until the resultant discontent with the outcome of reformism and loss of enthusiasm in Labour ranks made it possible for the Tory ruling class once again to take over openly the reins of government. Even so they found it necessary to tread delicately at first, with the methods of Butler and Monckton, before they could move on to brandish the ugly fist of a Thorneycroft, an Amory, a Brooke or a Macleod behind the cold sneering smirk of a Macmillan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Showdown—This Time**

These years since the war have seen the generation of a new flood of illusions (especially among the younger generation brought up without knowledge of other conditions) to soften the harsh outlines of capitalism and the class struggle in a roseate mist. All the phrases of 'this modern era of full employment', the 'new capitalism' and the 'abolition of poverty by the welfare state' still litter the pages of the Labour Party policy pamphlets and the endless dreary books of the antiquated 'new thinkers'. This old phrase-making looks a bit faded now in the light of the real modern world. The showdown has begun. This time the first spearhead of the offensive has not been directed against the miners. The sudden economic collapse of the coal industry with the onset of the inter-war depression has not been reproduced, although the sanguine naive expectations of some of the miners' national leaders that the coal industry could count on abounding scope and employment for many years to come have already received a shock. The offensive against the miners is still in its initial stages, with closing down of pits, ending of the Saturday shift and rejection of wage demands. Nor has the offensive been opened yet directly against the engineers, the strongest and most powerful section of the workers in present conditions. 1958 is no mechanical reproduction of 1921-22. The offensive has been opened against the nationalised industries, and within them against the economically weakest industries, the most vulnerable sections, the lowest paid workers, against the railwaymen, and, in the first place, against the busmen. And it is here that the question of class strategy most obviously arises.

**Class Confrontation**

Everyone recognises that the present attack on the busmen is the signal, the spearhead, the try-out for a general attack on the workers' standards and against the trade unions. There is no mystery about this. The Cohen Report proclaimed the aim aloud. Every speech of every Minister proclaims it. Every newspaper article proclaims it. The battle is not about the fractional financial difference between the award and the busmen's final claim (indeed, Mr. Cousins' last minute offer to reduce the award of 8s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. in order to spread the thin margarine all round removed any financial difference). The financial difference between the award and the claim would not be comparable for a moment with sums the Government is prepared to throw away any day without a ripple on a rejected missile or aircraft design or re-equipping the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Royal Yacht or a vast military installation in Cyprus due soon to be abandoned. No. The battle, as every Minister's speech and kept press editorial insists, is about 'a principle'. The 'principle' is that wage increases must not be granted to meet increases in the cost of living, *i.e.*, that real wages must come down. The 'firm stand' against the busmen is demanded in order to give notice to all other sections and to the whole trade union movement.

**Class Battle**

Thus we have here a class battle between the Government and the trade union movement. The Trades Union Congress has recognised this to the extent of passing a resolution in support of the busmen's claim, following its rejection of the Cohen Report. To this extent it is recognised that what is here involved is not a sectional issue, but a class battle. The capitalist class forces are directly led by the Government. The industrial issue is thus in fact a political issue. Indeed, it is the heart of the present political situation. What is the strategy of the trade union and labour movement to meet this situation? Here is the crux of the whole present position.

**Trade Union Strength**

Hence the decisive question is not: Where do the busmen stand? The decisive question is: Where does the trade union movement stand? It has been customary to boast in the present period that the trade union movement has attained a record height of strength and organisation. And this is true. The eight and a half million organised trade unionists do not merely constitute more than one-third of all occupied persons in this country. They constitute the decisive majority of all productive workers in all the essential industries of this country; and the more decisive the sector of industry, the closer the approach to one hundred per cent trade unionism. Nor is this paper organisation. The lamentations and doubts which used to be expressed in some quarters about the younger generation of trade unionists having grown up without experience of the old major industrial struggles have been answered in the most positive fashion by the events of recent years. The absolute one hundred per cent response of the busmen is a portent. The previous response to the engineers' 24 hours token strike no less staggered the doubters or hostile observers, and has demonstrated the strength of the response to an official call for action.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Line Up of Class Forces**

Thus the strength is there. The readiness to respond to the call for organised action is there. Nor is this all. This tremendous potential strength of organised trade unionism in this country exists in a unique situation. This strength of organised trade unionism does not merely cover all the essential productive industries by which the nation lives and has its being. There is a further special feature. Britain is the only country in the world where the working class constitutes the absolute overwhelming majority of the population—four-fifths of all occupied persons, if all wage earners are included. There is no parallel to this in any country. The ruling class know this well. The forces of the Government and the capitalist class and their hangers on are in reality the weaker side, despite all their use of state power and the press, if it came to a final showdown of class strength on either side. That is why, in the entire modern period above all, the British ruling class have always concentrated, more consciously and consistently than any other ruling class, on strategy as the indispensable means for maintaining their power—to divide the workers, to nobble the Labour Party or trade union leaders, to isolate the vanguard, to prevent at all costs the mobilisation of the united strength of the working class. Indeed, the social function of reformism might be most briefly defined as the function to prevent the united action of the working class, which could end capitalism. In Britain, above all, the ruling class know that they cannot rule by superior force. They must rule by cunning.

**City and Downing Street**

On the side of capitalism the City, Downing Street and the press act as one, through all the varieties of tone and expression. The British ruling class have had longer experience than any ruling class in the world in the exercise of strategy, cunning and deception to maintain their power, alongside the rare and sudden use of open force. The dagger in the arms of the City of London commemorates the dagger with which the magnates stabbed Wat Tyler after the 'Boy King' had summoned the leader of the victorious peasantry to parley. Downing Street commemorates its original owner, the seventeenth century Sir George Downing, the notorious double agent ('perfidious rogue', as Pepys called him), who built up his fortune equally from republicans and monarchists, serving Cromwell with the same zeal with which he subsequently hunted down the regicides for execution. 'His character was marked by all the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mean vices, treachery, avarice, servility and ingratitude', remarked the prim old *Encyclopædia Britannica* of 1911; '"a George Downing" became a proverbial expression to denote a false man who betrayed his trust'. Thus the Stab in the Back is the crest of the City, just as the Double Cross is the emblem of Downing Street. And of such is the Governance of England. Writers of textbooks on the British Constitution, please note.

**Model of Class Strategy**

This British ruling class have not yet lost their cunning at home, even though the world situation is escaping them. The Government's offensive against the workers' wages and the trade unions, with its first round in the present battle against the busmen in isolation, has been a model of class strategy at every stage. They have prepared the ground for months in advance. They have united their forces. They have divided the enemy. Knowing that they are in reality the weaker side, they have done everything to avoid a head-on collision at the outset, and to promote and extend their aims by degrees. They have concentrated their initial attack on the weakest point of the enemy's front, making sure first that it was isolated. Every move so far in this new round of industrial conflicts, opening with the offensive on the busmen, could go straight into a manual of capitalist class strategy. These consummate crooks and sharpers are certainly not capable of solving the problems of Britain's economic situation; the contradictions of declining capitalism are against them. They have been continuously routed for four decades when it came to dealing with an adversary of superior calibre like the Bolsheviks, who knew beforehand every trick in their game, and who stood moreover on the stronger objective basis of a historically advancing force with the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism to guide them. But they certainly still know their onions when it is a question of class strategy at home to exploit the weaknesses of the British labour movement.

**First: the Artillery Barrage**

In accordance with all the best approved principles of military strategy, first came the artillery barrage to demoralise the enemy and the smokescreen to camouflage the offensive. This was represented by the Cohen Report and the accompanying flood of press and radio and television propaganda, all concentrated to present one theme with monotonous reiteration. The chosen theme was the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Big Lie: that wage increases outstripping the increase in productivity have been the cause of inflation and high prices. Every serious economist is aware that the opposite is the case. Even Professor Robbins, no champion of the left, writing in the April *Lloyds Bank Review* on the causes of inflation, frankly recognised: 'The rise of wage rates was, for the most part, the *consequence* rather than the *cause* of the situation'. The causes are rather to be found in the policies of the successive Governments and monopoly capitalism since the war, making heavy simultaneous demands on production outstripping the actual considerable increase and overstraining the economy. The wage battle has toiled behind the rise in prices with very unequal effectiveness. Real wages and mass consumption, compared with pre-war, have fallen behind the increase in productivity. However, the analysis of the true facts is of no concern to the technique of the Big Lie, which is essentially a military technique of strategic propaganda to prepare the ground for the offensive against demands for wage increases. Wage increases, it was insisted, must not be granted on grounds of increases in the cost of living, but solely in relation to new increases in productivity—at the same time as the Government is enforcing measures to restrict production, and capacity is under-used through no choice of the workers. Such was the preparation of the offensive.

**Second: Dividing the Workers**

In accordance with the principles of military strategy the second essential was to divide the enemy's forces. If the pure logic of the Cohen Report had been followed, it might have been thought that the first objective for attack should have been the engineers, whose strength of organisation and militant readiness have placed them in the vanguard of the working class army repeatedly leading the way and most successful in winning wage increases and thereby opening the path for other sections to advance behind them. Alternatively, the miners are in the forefront of those who have transformed their position in the order of wage levels since the war, compared with before the war. But the Government was not born yesterday. They are concerned with strategy, not with abstract justice. They had no wish to begin their trial of strength with the strongest. Each section is handled separately at a different tempo. The offensive against the miners is still at an early stage. The showdown with the engineers is still in front. They preferred to begin with nationalised transport—precisely the section where real wages were lowest and admittedly below pre-war levels and far

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

below the general rise in productivity. Most unjust, from the point of view of the professed arguments of the offensive. Most rational, from the point of view of strategy. And even here they were concerned to separate the busmen from the railwaymen, so that the negotiations and strike threats should develop at different times. They even attempted to split the busmen with the 8s. 6d. award for Central London drivers and conductors and nothing for the remainder. This last was the only splitting attempt that failed. For the rest the different trade union sections moved obediently into their different schedules for negotiation without concerted resistance —like sheep herded into their different pens to be dealt with by the shearer in turn at his convenience.

**Third : Concentrate the Attack on the Enemy's Weakest Point**

On May 5, after eight months of the preliminary barrage, the offensive was opened. The offensive was opened against the London busmen in isolation. The Government had chosen to concentrate their entire initial attack on a single limited sector, the most vulnerable point in the enemy's front. The most vulnerable not in the sense of any lack of organisation or solidarity or militancy of the busmen. But the most vulnerable in relation to their role in the totality of capitalist production. A London bus strike *in isolation,* with the railways and underground still running, could *least* damage capitalist production and profit-making interests, and could therefore be relatively the *least effective* in demonstrating the strength of the workers' weapon of withholding labour. Its main visible effect could only be to cause inconvenience to other wage-slaves, not to the capitalists, and on this basis, it was hoped, arouse feeling against the strikers. This last hope was disappointed; majority public opinion has been markedly with the busmen. It could not cause the loss of a penny from the pocket of any capitalist; for, while draining away union funds, it could only result in a relatively limited book-keeping addition to the 'deficit' of the Transport Commission, to be screwed out of the workers later. An ideal initial battle from the standpoint of the capitalists, with the advantage that, if it could be successful in this limited sector, this initial success could help to discourage the enemy and prepare the way for heavier encounters.

**Counter-Strategy?**

It might have been thought that all these elementary considerations of strategy would have been equally obvious to the powerful,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experienced and highly organised trade union and labour movement. Not at all. They have walked right into it. Every pawn in the game has so far moved into the position allotted by the strategy of the capitalists. The lying propaganda of the 'wage-price spiral' as the cause of inflation has been solemnly echoed by the right wing labour and trade union representatives of the Robens-Birch-Padley school. The main 'reply' has been to plead that a Labour Government would be more successful in inducing the trade unions to accept wage restraint; and the Labour Party has spent its time trying to foist such a formula on the Trades Union Congress. The different trade union sections have moved in the most docile fashion into their different timetables of negotiation. The miners are still tied up with their extraordinary scheme of compulsory arbitration accepted since the war. The elaborate complications of the differing 'duly constituted machinery of negotiation' for each section have fulfilled the function of keeping the different sections of workers apart. The London busmen found themselves having to go into action in isolation.

**Where is the Staff Work?**

The dramatic symbol of this anarchic disorganisation of the British trade union movement struck the imagination of the blindest, when the spectacle was presented of the organised London busmen coming out on strike with one hundred per cent solidarity, while the no less fully organised workers on the underground were continuing, not through any lack of sense of solidarity, but in obedience to the orders of their union, that is, in accordance with trade union discipline, to operate the tubes and thereby cancelling out the main effects of the bus strike. Was this, then, some last minute hitch or temporary disorganisation such as might arise unintentionally in the best regulated campaigns? Not at all. Everything was in order. Everybody was doing his duty. The Transport and General Workers' Union had no power to call the tubes 'black'. The National Union of Railwaymen was operating faithfully according to the dates of its own schedule of negotiations. The underground men were tied to the protracted process of arbitration on their own claim. The Trades Union Congress would not dream of interfering with the sovereignty of the unions.

**Whose Responsibility?**

Was there no time to concert action beforehand? On the contrary. The bus strike notices were handed in on April 2. There

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a month to prepare. Four and a half weeks. Not long, but sufficient. From the first day after April 2 it was obvious that the crucial question would turn on the buses and tubes, and that the whole attention of the unions concerned and of the entire London movement would need to be concentrated on this task of co-ordination. What was done? No attempt was made until the last moment, and then too little, and too late. In contrast, the timing of the strategy of the Government can be noted, when, *after* the bus strike had begun, the danger sharply arose, despite all the delaying calculations, of a rail strike coinciding. The Government at once directly intervened, first to spin out negotiations ('While there's talk, there's hope', said the *Daily Herald* on May 10—meaning that there was 'hope' that the busmen would be left isolated), and then to make the 3 per cent offer with strings attached.

**Lessons to Learn**

It would be premature to attempt to judge the outcome of the present conflict at the initial stage so far reached. At the time of writing (May 14) the busmen were still fighting in isolation, and the railwaymen had still to reach their decision on the insulting offer of 7d. in the £ with dismissals of thousands of railwaymen and economies. New events may rapidly alter the whole line-up of the situation. But the lessons of this initial phase need to be learned. These lessons are serious, and require the most serious discussion and consideration. If there is not a rapid change from this whole slipshod tradition of anarchistic sectionalism, of helpless playing into the hands of the strategy of the Government and the capitalist class; if there is not a conscious change to planned and concerted action which brings into an effective role the real strength of the trade union and labour movement; then, whatever the heroism of particular struggles which may develop, we shall be in danger of repeating in the final outcome the experience of the inter-war years in place of advancing to the new victories which can and must be won.

## 2. *Class and Party*

What is to be done? How can we overcome this dangerous sectional anarchism and helpless defeatist subjection to the strategy of the capitalist class? Why must they always be united and the workers divided? Why must they always choose the time

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and place of battle, singling out one section most convenient to themselves for the purpose of a contest, while in effect ordering other sections out of the ring under the plea of separate negotiations and due procedure? The immediate short-term practical answer in the present round of contests, under all the practical difficulties of the present conditions, is obvious. It is necessary to exert every endeavour, at every level, both below and above, in the factories and plants, in the union branches and district committees, and in the union executives, to secure the maximum possible co-operation, concerted planning and united action in the present crucial battle over wages, jobs and standards, affecting all industries. It is necessary to popularise anew the conceptions of united action in a way that has been all too little done since the days of the old campaigning for industrial unionism and the Triple Alliance. It is necessary even to endeavour to stimulate the General Council to recognise its responsibilities, in accordance with its constitution, to assist common action (not restraint of action), and to develop the fullest active role of the trades councils. All this is immediate. But it is evident that the problem goes deeper.

**No General Staff of Labour**

What is this deeper problem? It can be put most simply in these terms. There is a general staff of the capitalist class, operating through the machinery of government, which in fact co-ordinates and leads the actions of the capitalists in the class battle. There is no corresponding General Staff of Labour. It is true that there exists a National Council of Labour. But this is purely a co-ordinating body of the Trades Union Congress, Labour Party and Co-operative movement, meeting at rare intervals for the purpose of issuing some general joint statement of policy. It plays no practical role in the class struggle. The trade unions play their role, for better or worse, in relation to their industries and on behalf of their particular membership. They are associated in the Trades Union Congress for the purpose of discussing and formulating general views on policy, and sometimes for regulating inter-union questions by methods of conciliation; but they are justly suspicious of any suggestion to surrender their sovereignty under the existing set-up. The Labour Party operates in the parliamentary and electoral sphere, and plays no active role in the industrial struggle, though often deprecating it as a menace to parliamentary and electoral interests, and urging policies of class conciliation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**General Council and General Staff**

When the old Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress was transformed into the General Council shortly after the first world war, there was some talk in left wing circles of the aim to make this change a first step towards the establishment of a General Staff of Labour. This found reflection in the slogan 'All Power to the General Council'. One of the advocates of the change, William Mellor, at that time a member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, later Editor of the *Daily Herald,* used to say that the change would in fact mean in its first effect the creation of a weapon against the left wing, but that it was necessary to support the change as a step in the direction of the further aim. In practice the General Council so far, under right wing leadership, even while sometimes fulfilling a progressive role in general policy (as in the Anglo-Soviet Trade Union Committee), has never attempted to function as a general staff, and has intervened more often in a restrictive sense in respect of militant trade unionism, through the encouragement of 'black circular' policies, or limiting the role of trades councils. Under these circumstances the jealous protection of their sovereignty by the individual unions has represented a mainly positive and healthy factor. When the unions have sought to organise common action, they have devised special *ad hoc* extra-ordinary forms, such as the Conference of Trade Union Executives—reflecting the recognition of where real power lay. But these rare temporary devices have represented no solution of the problem of the organisation and leadership of the class strategy of the working class against capitalism.

**No Use Blaming Individual Leaders**

Nor is the problem a problem of individual leaders. It is true that the total collective effect of the existing system of reformist leadership and structure of the labour movement, as described, is to split, disorganise and demobilise the effective strength of the working class in face of the united strategy of the capitalist class. But the main body of reformist trade union leaders are not performing this role out of wickedness of heart or with any deliberate evil intent. The type of a J. H. Thomas, of the fully corrupted and conscious agent of capitalist policy in the working class, eventually going over openly to the class enemy, has always existed and still exists today, though the laws of libel would prevent any naming of living names. But this is a special social phenomenon, a special stratum, the extreme and final outcome of reformism. The majority

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of reformist trade union leaders are respectable, conscientious, serious, hard-working, responsible officials, genuinely trying to do their best, according to their lights, for their membership, and to pursue what they would regard as a realist, practical, hard-headed policy for securing the best possible results for the section of workers they represent, and to defeat 'irresponsible' policies of 'hotheads'. Their function as they understand it is the representation of the economic interests of their particular section of workers, not the leadership of the class. Nor can the mere coming together of representative sectional interests into a General Council fulfil the function of class leadership that is required. The cause of the problem, and the line of solution, must therefore be sought deeper than in the character of individual leaders.

**Party and Class**

Once the conditions of the problem are thus analysed, the conclusion is inescapable. The problem is a *political* problem, not simply one of machinery. The aggregation of sectional interests cannot produce the leadership of the class. The experience of the General Council has proved this. Nor can the extension of the same sum total of sectional interests into the parliamentary field, together with middle class elements remote from the class struggle and often opposed to it, provide the leadership of the class. The experience of the Labour Party has proved this. The class interests of the working class as a whole can only be represented by a *political class party* of the working class, created and organised expressly for the function of representing the *common class interests,* both short-term and long-term of the working class, not in opposition to the other organisations of the working class movement, but exercising its role within them, and thereby making unity and united action possible.

**Marxism and the Communist Party**

This was precisely the description given long ago by Marx and Engels in their *Manifesto of the Communist Party,* to define the necessity and the role of the Communist Party as the organisation, not in opposition to the other organisations of the working class, but to represent the common class interests, present and future, and also international, of the working class ('always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole'). The Communist Party is not set up *over* other organisations to *command* other organisations (the attempted *mechanical* solution of unity,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which can only fail). Its responsibility of leadership can only be exercised *within* the movement, within the working class and the organisations of the working class, because its membership is spread at every point within the working class, in the factories and localities, and in the mass organisations at every level. Such an aim cannot be realised at a stroke. Its full realisation can only be the outcome of a whole preceding period of development and experience of the working class. But the fulfilment of this aim is the indispensable condition of victory of the working class and of the final victory of socialism.

**Towards the Aim**

It was with this conception and aim in view, on the basis of the preceding experience of the trade union movement and of the Labour Party, that the militant class-conscious socialists in the various organisations (British Socialist Party, Independent Labour Party, the Labour Party and other organisations) and militant trade union fighters and shop stewards' leaders united nearly four decades ago to establish the Communist Party. Most of them had been associated previously in the fight for industrial unionism and the Triple Alliance, and against the imperialist war. Their experience in the broad labour movement and mass struggle had taught them the necessity of such a political class party of the working class to fulfil its function within the general movement, day-to-day struggle and mass organisations.

**Advancing Realisation**

The record of these four decades has proved the justification of this step forward. Despite all limitations, and without minimising the role of many and varied militant fighters and sections, the historical record demonstrates that throughout this period again and again almost every major positive step and advance in the field of the class struggle, such as are today recalled with pride by the whole movement, has been associated directly with the initiative and campaigning of the Communist Party. It is only necessary to recall the solidarity campaign of 1921-26, leading up to Red Friday and the general strike; the leadership of the unemployed and the Hunger Marches of the 'thirties; Spain and the International Brigade; the fight for the Second Front; the defeat of the wage-freeze; the pioneering role in the fight against nuclear weapons, today fortunately taken up by so many who then passively accepted or even supported them; or most recently, the elaboration of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only concrete programme for the achievement of socialism in Britain, the *British Road to Socialism*. All this is a beginning, the first step to the necessary new phase of the British labour movement. But it is still only the initial stage.

**Path to Working Class Victory**

The gravity of the present situation underlines the urgency of more rapid advance along this road. Although the numbers of the Communist Party are today ten times those in the early days, four times those on the eve of the general strike, and nearly double those on the eve of the second world war, they are all too few for the tasks to be accomplished. If so much could be accomplished during the past period by the organised role of a few tens of thousands, it is manifest that a Communist Party of a hundred thousand could in fact transform the British Working class movement; and it might almost be hazarded that, in the special conditions of Britain, with the tremendous organised mass strength, solidarity and fighting experience of the working class, a Communist Party of a quarter of a million would mean the victory of the working class and socialism. This may appear to many an oversimplified or too optimistic picture, in view of the many other factors affecting the perspective; and any adequate analysis would have to take these further factors into account. Nevertheless this deliberately oversimplified picture is nearer to the heart of the present situation in Britain than most of the conceptions still current.

**Ruling Class Anti-Communist Campaign**

The ruling class understand well enough this essential character of the present line-up of class forces and the class situation in Britain. They know that the Communist Party represents the only conscious and organised political expression of irreconcilable hostility to their class rule, the only political force which they can never hope to control, bribe, infiltrate or vanquish by any of their methods of force or cunning. They understand very well that, once the co-operation of the Communist Party and the other sections of the labour movement is effectively established, the present divisions and disorganisation will be ended, the unity of the working class and all sections in action against capitalism will be achieved, and the day of the end of their class rule will draw into view. They demonstrate their understanding by the present intensification of their anti-communist campaign through every means of propaganda and disorganisation of the labour movement they can utilise.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**No 'Dual Loyalty'**

In vain *The Times* (May 12, 1958), in pursuit of this campaign, devotes a lengthy editorial to denounce what it calls the 'dual loyalty' of Communist trade unionists, and on this basis calls for the extension of the witch-hunt and 'black circular' methods in all trade unions, in the same way as in the Labour Party or trades councils. There is and can be no 'dual loyalty'; for the interests of the section and the working class are one. The Communist trade union official loyally carries out the decisions of his organisation, also when he is in a minority. At the same time all Communist trade unionists, in common with all militant trade unionists, constitutionally agitate for the policies which they believe to be in the interests of their union and of the working class. Nor can it fail to be noted that it is precisely those unions where the influence of the communist working class outlook is most marked in the leadership or policy, which have achieved the biggest advances in membership and in successes gained. Similarly the record of the past decades would show how the majority of the most positive and constructive resolutions of Trades Union Congresses throughout this period, which are today universally recognised and cited as such, have again and again been won thanks in no small measure to Communist initiative, sponsorship and campaigning.

**Learning the Lesson**

The deeper lessons of the present situation, revealing at once the tremendous potential strength of the working class, and the existing division and disorganisation of that strength, resulting in the continued domination of capitalism, need to be drawn. At the same time as we recognise the immediate current tasks to build up solidarity in the wage struggle and against the capitalist economic offensive, and the immediate political necessity to press forward the fight for peace and for the defeat of the Tory Government, we need also to recognise the imperative overriding long-term essential for the solution of the problems of the present stage of the working class movement. That essential is to speed the development and strengthening of the political class party of the working class as the key to united action and victory in every immediate struggle, and the indispensable weapon for the final victory of the working class and socialism. These lessons are submitted for serious consideration and discussion by all active trade unionists and socialists.

*May 14, 1958.* R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# Discussion Conference

**In response to readers' requests, the Editorial Board of *Labour Monthly*, in conjunction with a number of sponsors, has decided to convene a Discussion Conference on**

## BRITAIN AND THE COLONIES

It will be held on SUNDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1958, at Denison House, Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, S.W.1 (10.30 a.m.-5 p.m.)

The following have already indicated their support as sponsors:

**Percy Belcher; Cedric Belfrage; John Berger; J. G. Crowther; Rev. Stanley Evans; Arthur Horner; The Very Rev. Hewlett Johnson, M.A., B.Sc., D.D.; S. Leff, M.D., D.P.H.; Councillor Joan Maynard, J.P., C.C.; Alderman J. H. Nicholson; Harold Poole; D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; Councillor E. A. C. Roberts; Archibald Robertson.**

Names of speakers and further details will be announced later.

Readers well know that there have been great changes in this sphere. **Many victories have been won. But urgent problems remain.**

There is growing interest and wide discussion in the Labour and Trade Union movement, as witnessed at Conferences, in the publication of important Labour Party policy pamphlets, and in the expansion and influence of the Movement for Colonial Freedom.

**A HOST OF NEW QUESTIONS** arises:

**Is colonialism dead or dying?** What are the new forms of the liberation struggle today?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What should be Labour's attitude on immediate issues of struggle in the colonies (*a*) **democratic rights** (*b*) universal **suffrage** (*c*) withdrawal of **armed forces,** especially from those territories under white settler domination (*d*) **war bases** in colonies and dependencies?

**Can the British people prosper without colonies?** How can political independence be completed by **economic independence?** What should be Labour's attitude on British capital investments and on **economic aid?** How should aid be given, to whom, and from what source?

Colonies mainly produce raw materials. Their prices are declining and **unemployment** is growing, as in Britain. Are these two sides of the same problem?

What should be the attitude of **the next Labour Government** to the Commonwealth, and, in particular, to the remaining colonial territories?

How can British trade unions best help the **colonial trade unions?**

What should be Labour's attitude to the problems of colonial and **coloured workers in Britain?**

It is not the object of the Conference to lay down ready-made conclusions. Its purpose is to provide a forum for free and informal expression of all opinions from the Labour and Socialist standpoint.

*The Conference will be open to delegates from trade unions, trades councils, organisations of the Labour Party, Co-operative Movement, Communist Party, and other interested organisations.* LABOUR MONTHLY *readers and their friends are also welcome to attend as individuals.*

*There will be two sessions (1) on the Present Position of British Imperialism (2) Solidarity with the Colonial Peoples. The delegation fee is 2s. 6d. and 2s. for individual visitors. All communications should be addressed to the* CONFERENCE MANAGER, LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3.

**READERS! See that your organisation sends delegates! Make this Conference widely known and help to ensure a big and successful venture!**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# UNEMPLOYMENT WARNING

Sir Richard Coppock

*General Secretary, National Federation of Building Trades Operatives*

WHENEVER unemployment strikes, it hits the building industry with special force. Since January of this year, even after taking into account the seasonal fluctuations, the trend to unemployment in the building industry has shown a significant increase. The present Tory policies are coming home to roost.

Can there be hope for the building industry under the present type of government? Indeed, can Britain survive Tory policies? Are prices to increase and unemployment to grow until the crash comes? A brief examination of the state of the building industry is instructive. Building workers may justly say to miners, transport workers, engineers—you have been warned.

The first economic consequence of Toryism is unemployment, or 'redundancy', as they prefer to call it. Though the Tories may pay lip-service to full employment, it is by their deeds that we know them. Whatever their smooth talk, in hard fact the Tory Government pursues as a matter of deliberate intent a financial policy which can have no result but unemployment. And they know it.

Readers of *Labour Monthly* will have noted the ugly reality of the recommendations of the Cohen Report which emerge from the mist of jargon and platitudes. These add up to: more unemployment; wages held down; the Rent Act to stay; all controls and subsidies remaining to go; and no limit on profits and dividends.

Is history to repeat itself, with a slump such as overwhelmed the capitalist world a quarter of a century ago, with an army of three million unemployed? Be that as it may, certainly the policies and economics of Bedlam which led to it are being repeated: for capitalism is Bedlam. In 1932 a third of the total number in the building industry were unemployed—just on 300,000: nearly seven times the figure today. But before we congratulate ourselves too easily we must subject unemployment figures to a closer scrutiny.

Building trade workers stand a two-to-one chance of being workless compared with workers in other industries. One million building workers out of a labour force of twenty million employed in major industries: they number one-twentieth. But out of close on half a million unemployed, some 50,000 are building trade workers, that is one in ten.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In October, 1956, the number of workers in the building and civil engineering industries was 1,103,000. A year later there were only 1,059,000, a drop of 4 per cent. So real unemployment is heavier than appears from official records, which take no account of those who, finding no outlet for their customary labour, leave the industry and are lost to its records.

Mr. Iain Macleod, Minister of Labour, admitted in the House of Commons on February 26, 1958, that unemployed in the building and contracting industries in January, 1958, numbered 58,400, compared with 52,800 for the same month a year before and 35,400 in January, 1956. But these figures represent an increase over last year of 10·6 per cent in unemployment in the industry in Great Britain, and of as much as 65 per cent above that of two years ago. A month later the comparable figures had risen by 5 per cent.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN BUILDING AND CONTRACTING IN GREAT BRITAIN

| | *1957* | *1958* | *Percentage rise* |
|---|---|---|---|
| January .. | 52,831 .. .. | 58,409 .. .. | 10·6 |
| February .. | 55,167 .. .. | 61,763 .. .. | 11·7 |
| March .. | 48,189 .. .. | 59,532 .. .. | 23·5 |

The North is hardest hit. Reports from Yorkshire say that it has not been so bad since the end of the war; and Aberdeen woodworkers report the worst unemployment since 1945, mainly due to the cut in house-building, which the government's financial policy forced upon local councils.

True, these figures are still small. In the U.S.A., with over five million workless, unemployment is three times heavier, at over 6 per cent. If the massive U.S. arms programme 'saves the situation' economically over there, at what cost to humanity? Events in one capitalist country influence affairs in others. We are not too keen on armaments coming to the aid of employment in Britain.

The Tory Government's cure for our economic ills is to cut social services and restrict capital investment. Yet in house-building if the rate of new houses were to be 300,000 a year, the housing queue would not be reduced; and in fifty years' time, those still alive, their children and grandchildren would still be waiting for a house. It is not the £ that this policy saves, but the speculators, the Stock Exchange gamblers and interest and bondholders, whose disappearance would be an economic gain to the country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, we meet with the effects of Government policy in the high cost of building. When the unions demand a pay rise for the building worker they are met with the answer from the employers that each 1d. an hour increase adds £10 to the cost of a house. A simple formula, calculated to give the public the impression that it is the building worker's high wages which are responsible for the high cost of housing.

Compare this with the increase in the cost of a house caused by the government's deliberate raising the rate of interest charges to local authorities. If the local authorities seek to avoid the fabulous rates of interest in the open market (forced further up by the Government policy of high Bank rate) they must go cap in hand to the Public Works Loan Board, to which the Treasury dictates the minimum rate of interest. Thus on loans of fifteen years and over the rate charged by the Public Works Loan Board is 6¼ per cent, as against 3 per cent in 1951—when the Tories were returned to power. What does this extra 3¼ per cent interest charge increase add to the cost of a house? It adds no less than 21s. 8d. per week to the rent of a house built at £2,000. Compare that with the employers' simple formula of what 1d. an hour on wages costs: £10 per house, or ¾d. a week. Again, Tories abolished the standard subsidy of £29 8s. 0d., or 11s. 4d. a week, by which the 21s. 8d. could have been reduced.

Is it surprising that the January-February, 1958, issue of the *Operative Builder* could list over fifty councils in England and Wales alone which had reduced or dropped their housing programme?

So much for the fine words and promises for rebuilding Britain, with well-planned cities rising on the ashes of the old, about a replanned London, worthy of one of the foremost cities of the world.

The present Ministers serve their party and its interests well. But their party and their interests are not the peoples': they are not the interests of the old age pensioners, nor of the children nor of any who labour.

This economic system of theirs is man-made; and what is made by man can be unmade by him. The first step is to reject and eject this Government of the poor by the rich for the rich. The building industry cannot survive continued Tory policies. The country cannot survive them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# ASCENT TO THE SUMMIT

Ivor Montagu

WHY is it that the ascent to the summit appears so difficult? Why that, as so long with Everest, these last few yards appear so difficult to overcome? Listen carefully, I will let you into a great secret. *One section of the climbing party does not want to get there.* Indeed, it is hoping for a break in the favourable weather, the favourable climate of public opinion—a sort of disgusting wet political monsoon—to arrive in time to enable it to turn tail without losing face.

The fact is (and this is the secret), the Western statesmen do not want agreements. They do not want agreement of any kind. This includes even agreement on the conditions of talking. Agreement of any kind strikes at the whole myth on which not only their foreign policy, but also their home power, their existence as reactionary governments, ultimately as imperial and even capitalist social systems depend: the myth that Communists are unspeakable, treacherous swine who are forever out to do you down, cut your throat, and on whom you cannot possibly depend.

Without this myth they could not possibly induce their peoples to accept the political restrictions and economic burdens involved in the Cold War, they could not induce them to accept the colossal diversion of resources to unproductive expenditure involved in the arms programme, the long-term exile of a great portion of their youth involved in maintenance of vast forces overseas, the perspective of vast self-destruction on which their whole military strategy is based. Without this myth, their electorates might be even more inclined than they are to try changes toward a more moral and logical way of living together, they might breathe the word 'socialism'. To this, the myth provides the barrier. This is exactly what Dulles, the most far-sighted statesman that the West possesses, means when he says, frankly and openly: 'We must not lower our guard'.

Dulles, and the West that dances to his tune, cannot face the fact of agreement, irrespective of its content. They cannot accept it even if it is equal, equitable, representing an equal concession, a comparable risk. The very fact of its fairness makes it anathema; for, however limited, it contains proof of the fact that fair agreement is possible: and Dulles's fear must be not that it will not work, but that it may be workable, and thereby proof to the peoples that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# *Mexico*

Tilling the Soil

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*by* A. Garcia Bustos

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what they desire may be possible after all. The peoples' appetite will grow with what it feeds on, and one workable agreement, however limited, will become the basis of an irresistible demand for others. This is exactly what Khrushchov means when he says: the banquet should begin with the *hors d'oeuvres*.

The Soviet position regarding negotiations is exactly opposite from that of the Western statesmen. First, they have nothing to fear in peaceful co-existence. It is not the statesmen of socialism but of capitalism who lack confidence in their own system. The socialist statesmen have no doubt of humanity's choice, while the two systems exist side by side. And they believe that genuine peace, the abandonment of cold war, can only accelerate the progress of their system and the advantage of comparison. Therefore they seek agreement. Their sole concern is to ensure that the agreements *are* fair; that is, that they do not increase the temptation for the Western military to seek solutions by war, through endowing them with military advantage.

You might suppose that, with this difference of approach, not only no agreement, but no negotiation, is possible. This would be to underestimate the weakness in the Western-bloc position. This is, that they dare not avow it before world public opinion. They dare not avow it, not only before the uncommitted nations, but even before their own public. They have to pretend that their own position is like that of the Soviet Union, in wanting agreement and being concerned only that it should be fair. But as their real position differs from what must be their public position, they are concerned to avoid and delay negotiations; to ensure that, if and when these cannot be prevented from taking place, they shall be conducted in such a way that the real issues shall be shrouded in secrecy, and their trimmings be made so complex that the grounds for eventual disaccord can be misrepresented.

Unless this difference is fully understood, there is not only no chance that Summit Talks may end in agreement, it becomes extremely improbable that they will ever take place. The disagreements about procedure towards Summit Talks are not irrelevant, nor illustrative—by disagreement over trifles—of incompatibility of the two sides and therefore impossibility of agreement over greater things, as the Western statesmen would like to pretend. They are part of a battle by the Soviet Union to ensure that discussions take place in circumstances where the public will have the best chance to judge what is happening, and so the Western statesmen be subject

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to that pressure which, since it is more difficult for them to reject solutions which are patently fair and understood by the public to be so, alone can constrain them to agree.

Those who take it for granted that, as West and East both 'want peace', the main task is to get them together and that, once this hurdle is crossed, common need and sweet reason will bring them to agree; or those who take it for granted that sooner or later East and West will meet and the main thing is to think out fair solutions to help them when they do, alike completely misconceive the situation. On the contrary, the battle of procedure on the way to the summit, the battle of substance around the issues, are all part of the same struggle: the struggle of the Soviet Union to secure agreement by invoking public opinion against the Western statesmen on the basis of the facts, the struggle of the Western statesmen to evade agreement by postponing negotiation and deceiving the public. And only an understanding of this truth, and active, successful explanation of it, will enable peace to triumph.

Examine the procedural points in dispute. The Soviet desire for a Summit form of conference is based precisely on the endeavour to have negotiations take place in circumstances in which public opinion will exercise maximum pressure for agreement, because the attention this method will evoke, and the supreme responsibility of the participants, makes evasion of responsibility for failure most difficult. Of course it does not dispute the need for preparation, but the whole difference lies between: first, agreement to hold the conference, then consequential preparation for holding it; or, first, discussions about preparation without as yet agreement on its taking place, which leaves the door open, at any stage of preparation, to invent a disagreement which prevents the conference from taking place at all. Contrast the Western statesmen's pre-condition of a foreign ministers' conference; then, when that was agreed, their pre-condition of 'conversations through diplomatic channels', which, when agreed, immediately became exposed as an ambassadors' conference, all without any commitment to a Summit meeting. Note their preference for secret conversations and their objection to 'letter-writing'; here, as soon as the exchange of letters has effectively alienated sympathy from their approach, and the subjects and conditions laid down by them in the correspondence have evoked world-wide criticism from uncommitted nations and even sections of their own public, they seek to divert attention from the matter—the points on which they stand self-exposed as unreasonable—to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alleged 'fruitlessness' of the method (*i.e.*, their embarrassment at the self-exposure involved in the display by correspondence of both points of view).

Nor is the difference about the conduct of diplomatic-level negotiations (whether by the Western ambassadors separately or together, whether by parity or three to one), an incidental or trivial one, but one disclosing a key to the whole question. The issue of form is no less than the alternative: a form of negotiation in which, in event of breakdown, neither side can claim advantage so that world public opinion cannot be diverted and is left to judge the issues of breakdown nakedly on their merits; or a form in which, whenever a breakdown or on whatever issue, the Western statesmen can obscure the latter by concentrating their propaganda not on the substance disputed but on the 'isolation' of the Soviet Union (*i.e.*, its 'obstinacy', 'unreason', 'insincerity') demonstrated by the fact that the 'majority', determined by advance hand-picking and automatic, is always on their side.

The Soviet Union has had enough of this Western-bloc method of so-called 'negotiation through the United Nations', not because it underrates the U.N. or desires to avoid it, but because the Western statesmen invariably operate its constitution and select its committees to ensure that 'majorities'—often composed of states that comprise a far smaller fraction of the world's population than those disagreeing with them—are always present who are tied to them by client status. The resulting vote, automatic on whatever issue the Western bloc selects for the breach and totally irrelevant to the merits of the disputed issue, is paraded at will as 'majority endorsement' of the Western statesmen's attitude, to the confusion of their public opinion and diversion of the criticism that attitude has earned. In refusing ever again to enter conference by this method, the U.S.S.R. has not acted out of pique or impatience; it is simply trying to control the evasions of public opinion that the Western statesmen invariably and hypocritically employ when the other method is operated, and its confidence that its own stand on the disputed issues will be acceptable to public opinion judging objectively is demonstrated by the fact that it does not insist on parity of negotiating strength between East and West but between 'countries bound to the United States by the bonds of military agreements and receiving military, financial and other aid from it' on the one hand and 'socialist states and countries which do not belong to military groupings of powers' on the other.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A supreme example of this trickery of method which the U.S.S.R. is obliged to combat is shown by last year's disarmament negotiations. At the moment when even the committee thus picked was on the verge of reaching partial agreement as a result of what was universally admitted as substantial concession from the Soviet Union to the position previously adopted by the Western delegates, Dulles made a special journey to London and thenceforward all its Western members united, in repudiation of previous proposals of their own, in a plan they insisted upon as a whole, take it or leave it. No stopping of tests without stopping of manufacture of fissile material for weapons—thus linking a measure that was equal and capable of complete and easy control to another that was neither (note: western propagandists often pretend that the Soviet Union is reluctant to agree to stopping manufacture of nuclear weapons, this the Western negotiators never proposed. What they did propose, *i.e.*, the stoppage of manufacture of material for weapons, would enable U.S.A. to continue converting its inferior stock of A-bombs into a superior stock of H-bombs). Aerial inspection, but no renunciation of the nuclear weapons or elimination of stocks 'in the foreseeable future'. Reduction of conventional arms that in the first stage means reduction only of Soviet forces, not of those of the Western bloc, and second and third phases made dependent on 'political settlements' that were left undefined. Of course not only Soviet and 'uncommitted' critics, but even many voices in the West, at once stigmatised such proposals as insincere, and intended to be unacceptable. But having got its U.N. 'majority' endorsement for them, Dulles and Co. are exempted from defending their defects, they divert all attempt to analyse them by pointing to Soviet disregard of the 'majority' will.

As with procedure, so with suggested substance. The Soviet *hors d'oeuvres* represent realisable measures capable of being devised so as to be fair and controllable. The ending of tests (can it possibly be that the U.S.S.R. is further advanced after 39 explosions than the U.S.A. after 93?* Anyway the U.S. Government was equally against ending tests when it was itself indubitably in advance); disengagement in Europe (the Eden plan), either partial—a thinning on the ground—or complete, or limited in the first place to disengagement in respect to certain weapons only (the Rapacki Plan). Consultation and common self-denying ordinance about interference in the Middle East.

*Totals by May 13, 1958, from official figures of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Western-bloc proposals are on the other hand lumps of glue and cement calculated to choke any dinner: abandonment of the unanimity rule in the Security Council; unification of Germany by elections; discussion of internal situation in East European countries. There is not one serious political commentator who bothers to pretend that these demands are realisable *in the existing situation.* They are put forward with no other object whatsoever but to wreck all possibility of agreement; even better, perhaps, from the viewpoint of their proponents, to prevent negotiation on realisable questions from even starting. The first would mean, as the Security Council is constituted, world dictatorship for the Western bloc, total surrender for the Soviet Union. The second would mean, on the basis claimed by the West, of elections and Adenauer's right to join NATO, a ponderous addition to NATO's military strength in Europe and a yet more commanding position for the Nazi generals. They are mere Cold War claims, devoid of all sincerity, designed to 'score points' with the unthinking, who forget, firstly, that whatever sacred or magic character might attach to 'free elections' is not local to Europe and applies equally to Korea and to Vietnam, where the same West-bloc that advances them for Germany is no less obdurate in refusing them; and secondly, whatever may or may not be wrong with human rights or democracy among the Soviet Union's allies, is one hundred times more open to discussion in respect to the U.S.A. and its supporters: and how far should we get toward peace if we were to *start* with an agenda comprising South Africa, Algeria, Kenya, Portugal, Chiang, Rhee, Franco and Little Rock?

No less insincere was the U.S. suggestion that the world, alarmed by the news that U.S. planes laden with H-bombs were regularly flying toward Soviet borders over the Arctic, would be made more secure by a proposal which included in an inspection zone a vast territory of the U.S.S.R., without including an inch of the U.S.A. proper or one single U.S. bomber base abroad; and in the event of Soviet agreement to which Dulles said U.S.A. 'might' (mark that: not 'would' but 'might') 'considerably reduce' (not 'abandon' but 'reduce') such flights (*New York Herald Tribune,* May 2, 1958). And no less preposterous is Eisenhower's refusal to link international 'control of outer space' meaning 'of Soviet rockets capable of reaching U.S.A.' with the question of foreign bases, meaning the bases from which U.S. rockets can be discharged at U.S.S.R.

But insincerity, and even deliberate falsehood, are characteristic of the reasons constantly advanced by Western statesmen for one or

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other refusal to agree. Those who, through the blessed revelation of the telly, have had the boon of opportunity to study the faces and personalities of such as Macmillan and Lloyd may find it possible to believe that the stupidity of such 'statesmen' is illimitable. Can it be that when they lie about the uncontrolability of nuclear tests, or their harmlessness to man, they are really believing something they have been told? But when they give as reason for refusing to agree to ban nuclear weapons Soviet preponderance in conventional forces, without recalling that the Soviet Union agreed to reductions in conventional forces* far larger than those eventually agreed on in common by all the negotiators; and when they pretend that U.S.S.R. at Geneva agreed to reunification of Germany independent of consideration of European security, are they then so ingenious? Surely they can add simple sums and they can read?

Peaceably inclined persons often remind us that we do no good for peace by imagining ill of our opponents or imputing to them bad motives. I fully agree. Behaviour that in private persons would earn them the label of cheats and scoundrels may be and no doubt is often undertaken by statesmen with the best of motives. But equally, we do no good by ignoring facts. The facts are—leave the motives to Freud, their consciences and their answerability beyond the grave—that they seek to avoid negotiation, while avoiding the onus of such evasion, they put forward proposals they know are unrealisable and to disguise the character of Soviet proposals they know that their people would accept. And in the meantime, while quietening us with these sops, they proceed steadily forward with the perfecting of weapons of a character that make their incidental discharge, even accidental, sooner or later inevitable, and with the strengthening of allies whose dearest wish is to make that discharge happen sooner rather than later. We live on borrowed time. The world is not safe now, it is growing less safe, and can only be made safe by seeing through their pretensions and doing something about it. To get them to the summit, we will have to carry them there, and we will certainly have to push them to get them down happily.

*Originally proposed by Britain and France and then withdrawn under U.S. pressure.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# STRIJDOM'S 'TRIUMPH'

E. S. Sachs*

THE victory of Strijdom's Nationalist Party in the South African general election held April 16, is a clear exposure of the cant and hypocrisy of 'Parliamentary Democracy' as practised by some of the 'free nations' whom we are pledged to support against 'totalitarian communism' even by the use of H-bombs.

Of the 14½ million people in the Union, only the electors among the three million whites voted. The 9½ million Africans whose fate featured prominently in the election campaign were mere spectators —not altogether silent—without a vote. Even the three whites who represent them in parliament will soon be 'booted out' according to a statement by Dr. Verwoerd, Minister of Native Affairs. The 1¼ million Coloured voters had to content themselves with electing four Europeans two weeks prior to the general election. The 400,000 Indian people have no franchise right whatsoever. Even so far as the white voters are concerned parliamentary democracy has become a mockery in South Africa due to Nationalist gerrymandering. The Nationalists polled a total of 642,069 votes as against 503,828 cast for the United Party, the major opposition party. In 24 constituencies with a total voting strength of over 250,000 the Nationalists did not put up candidates: these are anti-Nationalist strongholds and had they been contested the majorities against Strijdom would have been at least ten to one. In one such constituency (Kensington, Johannesburg) where the Nationalists put up a candidate he lost his deposit. It may be accurately estimated that had all seats been contested the Nationalist aggregate vote would not have exceeded 665,000, and the anti-Nationalist vote would have been at least 700,000. In spite of receiving a minority vote, the Nationalists will have 103 seats in the new parliament as against 53 for the United Party. Since they first came to power in 1948, the Nationalists, employing all the tricks and chicanery of Hitler, made sure that they will remain in the saddle. Thus some 25,000 voters in South-West Africa including many Germans, by an act passed in 1953 were given the right to elect six

*Solly Sachs, widely-known for his leading role in the South African trade union movement including the National Treasurership of the South African Labour Party and extending over a quarter of a century until the ban on his activities (he was General Secretary of the Garment Workers' Union) was imposed by the infamous C. R. Swart, is now in exile in Britain. He has written, together with Lionel Forman, *The South African Treason Trial* (John Calder, pp. 216 illustrated, October, 1957, 18s.), a vividly written account of the background to the trial that has aroused so much protest in Britain.—Ed., *L.M.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

M.P.s—all urban constituencies average about 12,000. The average for the rural areas which are overwhelmingly Nationalist is well under 10,000. The Coloured voters of the Cape whose vote influenced, in some cases decisively, some ten constituencies were removed from the Common Voters roll by a series of underhand tricks. In addition the Delimitation Commission consisting of three recently appointed judges fixed the boundaries of constituencies in accordance with the wishes of the Nationalists.

What is of real importance to the people of South Africa and more especially to the 75 per cent who are disfranchised is the fact that, unless something unforeseen happens, the government of the country, parliament, the police, the army, the prisons and all the other coercive forces of the state will for the next five years be in the hands of Strijdom, Verwoerd, Swart, de Klerk and company, who are determined to maintain and extend ruthlessly the policy of 'Baaskap' (white supremacy).

### *Could Strijdom have been Defeated?*

An analysis of the alignment of forces in South Africa will conclusively show that the Nationalists have been able to capture and maintain power for the past ten years, not because of their innate strength, but only because of the weak-kneed and cowardly policy pursued by the United Party. The Nationalist Party draws its strength mainly from the backward rural areas and from some of the Afrikaner workers, of whom several hundred thousand have only in the last thirty years migrated from the poverty-stricken Platteland into the industrial areas. The overwhelming majority of the backward white farmers has always voted Nationalist and will not change their allegiance in the foreseeable future. There are, however, well over 30 industrial constituencies where the vote of the Afrikaner workers is decisive and which could have been won from the Nationalists. Three factors dominate the outlook of the several hundred thousand Afrikaner workers engaged in mining, transport, manufacturing and other occupations: these are Afrikaner Nationalism, fear of the non white, and the economic problems common to workers the world over (*e.g.*, high cost of living, lack of security, housing, etc.). For nearly thirty years I worked in close contact with these workers and from my own experience and the experience of other trade union leaders I can positively state the following.

The unskilled and low-paid Afrikaner worker is almost all Afrikaner Nationalist and bitterly anti-African. As his skill and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

living standards improve he is inclined to lose his extreme nationalism, thinks increasingly as a worker, and his attitude towards the non-white worker fluctuates between fact and fantasy. The facts indubitably prove that the influx of non-white workers in industry and improvement in their skill constitute no threat whatever to the employment opportunities and standards of the white worker: on the contrary the all-round economic progress of the country saved the Afrikaners from being dragged down in mass into the abyss of Poor Whitism. The Colour Bar offers no protection to the white worker; it only hampers progress and undermines his standards and employment opportunities.

The leaders of the Nationalist Party, having swallowed the Nazi technique, come to the Afrikaner worker with an appeal to his basest emotions, *i.e.*, incitement of hatred for the non-white, enmity towards the British and in addition skilfully flog the Communist bogey. Events in the last thirty years have proved beyond doubt that the only effective reply to the Nazi fascist adventurers is a relentless challenge to all forms of reaction, an unequivocal, energetic exposure of all racial and other myths and fantasies and a clarion call for the defence of elementary economic and political rights. Any pandering to backwardness or equivocation must inevitably lead to a triumph for reaction.

Instead of fighting on an independent, progressive policy, cooperating with the Labour Party, the trade unions and all other progressive elements, in short, following the New Deal example of Roosevelt and the Democratic Party in the 30's, the poltroons of the United Party came out with a wretched, contemptible 'Me Too' policy and spent more time and energy during the election campaign in trying to convince the white voters that they too stood for 'Baaskap', than in drawing them away from the irrational, the emotional fear cunningly spread by the Nationalists. The confused white voters reacted as one might have expected: 'If "Baaskap" means the saving of the Whites from being overwhelmed by the Blacks, then we prefer to entrust our fate to the hands of Strijdom who is more ruthless and clear on the matter than you are', and they voted Nationalist.

The United Party is composed of three social groups with identical yet conflicting interests; the all-powerful mining interests, the backward more prosperous agrarians who are becoming less important, and the industrialists, the most progressive section whose

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence and importance are growing. So far, the colonialist mining interests and the feudal agrarians have dominated United Party policy. Their principal concern is a vast reservoir of cheap African labour which they would like to secure without the extravagance and ruthlessness of Verwoerd, Swart, de Klerk and Co. The hard-boiled mineowners are more concerned with the survival of their dividends than in the survival of the white race. They will support, employ or accept any expedient that will serve their interests and supply them with a vast army of indentured labourers. Thus they support the Colour Bar to keep the African down, and at times oppose it with the object of reducing the wages of the White workers. They prefer their depredation to proceed peacefully but will not hesitate to use violence against Africans who demand higher wages. They talk liberalism but accept apartheid. There is a sort of unholy pact between the Chamber of Mines and Strijdom; the former looks after the cash and the latter after the Afrikaner soul and white civilisation. The 16,000 factory owners are opposed to apartheid and are fearful of de Klerk's job reservation tactics—under the Industrial Conciliation Act, 1957, he has unchallengeable power to exclude all non-whites from industries, trades and occupations.

There is no data available to indicate the factors which influenced the white voters in the election. This, however, is clear: the one million English-speaking South Africans voted solidly against Strijdom. How many of these are against apartheid and how many are against Strijdom due to his violent anti-British tirades and pin pricks (*e.g.*, barring the Union Jack from public buildings, also 'God Save the Queen' from being sung at public functions, etc.) is hard to say. What is common knowledge is that the voters who voted United Party were more anti-Strijdom than pro-United Party. Most of them look upon the United Party leadership and tactics with utter contempt. What is also known is that 25 per cent of the Afrikaners voted against Strijdom, but the young Afrikaners voted solidly Nationalist.

To defeat the Nationalists and thus crack the front of solid reaction is a difficult job but not impossible. If all the anti-apartheid forces united, the United Party adopted an independent progressive policy instead of a 'Me Too' line, a Labour Party were built which championed the cause of the Afrikaner workers without supporting the Colour Bar, and more work were done to educate the Afrikaner workers along democratic lines, there would be a good chance of ousting the Nationalists.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The major factor in South African politics is the growing strength of the non-white people, but democratic progress would be furthered if all progressive whites concentrated their attention on the white workers instead of merely waiting for the inevitable clash to come. The Afrikaner workers have been left to the tender mercies of the race haters for too long, and it is time that the left in South Africa took the message of progress to the homes and places of work of these workers and did not write them off as hopeless racialists.

### *The Not So Silent Disfranchised Eleven Million*

The mass of Africans are not only disfranchised, but are even denied the elementary right of protest against their enslavement. To demonstrate their resentment against their helotry, the African National Congress called upon workers to stay away from work from April 14 to 16, a call supported by the other Congresses. The campaign was to be conducted along the lines of passive resistance, free from violence or disturbances, a dignified protest of millions of human beings who are denied the most elementary rights in the land of their birth.

The champions of Baaskap, however, would not allow any form of demonstration, however passive, from the oppressed. Jan de Klerk, Minister of Labour and brother-in-law of J. G. Strijdom, addressing voters in South-West Africa, said with fury: 'There will be a counter demonstration in which the white man will not only talk white supremacy but will prove white supremacy'. To strike terror among the Africans and fear in the hearts of the whites, C. R. Swart, Nationalist Minister of Justice, staged endless parades of armoured cars and policemen armed to the teeth. Offices of various democratic organisations throughout the country were raided and several hundred people were arrested. The United Party and its press joined the furious campaign of intimidating and demoralising the Africans, and the factory owners also played an active role by threatening to victimise Africans who stayed away from work. The division in the ranks of the African National Congress and the lack of organisation no doubt contributed to the failure of the demonstration. The indignation in the hearts of millions of Africans, however, and their craving for liberty will not be stifled by terror and intimidation. The masses of African people are rapidly awakening.

What of the future? In recent months racist reaction has not only scored a triumph in South Africa but also further north in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rhodesias and Kenya, but these triumphs have in no way solved the final problems facing the twenty million non-white and three million whites in those parts of the African continent. On the contrary, there is a deeper and more widespread feeling of insecurity and of fear among the whites now than there has ever been, and every victory of the racists accentuates that fear. The oppressed people of the African continent, Black and Arabic numbering well over two hundred million, are awakening. There are many differences—cultural, economic, social, political and in historical background—among the people of Africa, but they are all united in their demands to put an end to colonial oppression and racial discrimination. Whilst the whites were counting the votes in Pretoria and Johannesburg, and Sir Roy Welensky was vilifying the British Labour Party and talking the arrogant language of Strijdom, for the first time in history eight independent African states met at Accra to consider problems facing the African continent as a whole. Further north the Algerian people are heroically fighting with arms in their hands the mighty military power of France. The Colons* of Algeria are as stupid and depraved as the majority of the whites of Southern Africa.

The triumph of the twelve hundred million Asian people over their oppressors seems to have had no effect upon the three million whites in Southern Africa, who have lost all sense of reality and are guided in their actions by fear and *herrenvolk* nonsense. The world is moving rapidly towards freedom, but they are obstinately determined to build for themselves a slave state with the whites as masters and the non-whites as slaves.

Southern Africa has made considerable economic progress in the last decade, but the streets of Johannesburg are deserted at night and further north white men carry guns when they go to bed or to the lavatory. In the interests of the millions of Africans, and the interests of the Whites themselves, the inhuman policy of Baaskap must be brought to an end as quickly as possible. The leaders of the African people, whose ability, foresight and courage puts the self-appointed saviours of white civilisation to shame, will have to pay more attention to organisational problems and more especially to the building of African trade unions. When two hundred thousand African workers in South Africa are organised in effective trade unions the unarmed African workers will have tremendous

*French and other settlers from Europe, many of them big landlords.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic power, which no repressive laws of Verwoerd will be able to destroy. The several hundred thousand white workers, the majority of whom feel extremely unhappy with the Nationalist government but whose leaders are as yet too weak-kneed to fight with courage and determination, will accept unity with the African workers only when the latter are strong. The policy of apartheid is bound to cause a serious crisis in the South African economy, and this crisis may be expedited by international factors, the recession in the U.S.A., the drying up of capital inflow and the fear of the future which investors will feel. The task of freeing South Africa from racial oppression and tyranny is primarily one for the people of South Africa themselves, but the British and international labour movement and all who have the cause of African freedom at heart can do much to further the cause of freedom by rendering maximum support to the democratic organisations within Southern Africa. It is sincerely hoped that the British Labour Party, which has come out openly on the side of democracy, will not be frightened by the abuse of Mr. Strijdom and the threats of Mr. Welensky. The protagonists of the Master Race theory, whether championing openly the brutal policy of apartheid or masquerading under the hypocritical guise of 'partnership', are not only the enemies of the Black people but, if allowed to pursue their pernicious policies, will bring inevitable ruin to the Whites, and their insane policy must receive no support whatever from Britain. The British and international trade union movement must establish close contacts with the workers of Southern Africa and give them maximum organisational, technical and financial support. International opinion, which has consistently denounced apartheid, must not relax its effort because of Strijdom's successes; on the contrary, it must move from verbal attacks to positive action. The independent African states must cease using diplomatic language in fighting colonial oppression and racial discrimination, and must instead employ the maximum effort to obtain the whole-hearted co-operation of all civilised countries in their aim to put an end to African oppression.

---

**BRITAIN AND THE COLONIES. Don't miss the important announcement (page 258) of the Discussion Conference.**

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# SCIENTISTS AGAINST NUCLEAR ARMS

Dr. E. H. S. Burhop

IN addressing public meetings about stopping tests of nuclear weapons and abolishing their manufacture, I am often asked what scientists are doing to avert the dangers arising from these weapons. It is quite evident that many people blame scientists for having worked on these weapons and for continuing to work on them. It is often suggested that scientists should stage a strike and refuse to work further on weapons of mass destruction and in this way stop the development of even more frightening instruments.

Now, I wish with all my heart that scientists would not work on these weapons and I believe scientists must recognise that in this matter they bear a special and a very heavy load of responsibility. Nevertheless, the attempt to place the main blame on the scientists is misguided and harmful. Clearly, in so far as we have acquiesced, without protest, in the decisions of successive British governments to manufacture, first atomic bombs and then hydrogen bombs, we all must bear a measure of responsibility. Yet it is useful to recall the major part played by scientists in many countries in the campaign against the development of nuclear weapons and their use.

As early as June, 1945, before the bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, before even the first successful test explosion of an atomic weapon, a group of American scientists who had been engaged on the war-time atomic bomb project presented a report to the American Secretary of War in which they counselled very strongly against the use of the bomb against Japan. This report, which has come to be known as the Franck report, after Professor James Franck, the chairman of the group that prepared it, in warning against the use of the bomb stated:

> It may be very difficult to persuade the world that a nation which was capable of secretly preparing and suddenly releasing a new weapon as indiscriminate as the rocket bomb and a thousand times more destructive, is to be trusted in its proclaimed desire of having such weapons abolished by international agreement. . . . If the United States were to be the first to release this new means of indiscriminate destruction of mankind, she would sacrifice public support throughout the world, precipitate the race for armaments, and prejudice the possibility of reaching an international agreement on the future control of such weapons.

It is tragic that the opinion of the seventy-one scientists who signed this statement did not prevail. Instead the fateful decision to use

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bomb against Japanese cities was taken. The world has never been quite the same since that decision.

After the war, American scientists played a very important role in their attempts to influence the development of policy on nuclear weapons. As a result of an unprecedented campaign, in which they descended on Washington in strength, they were successful in having the control of the American atomic energy development transferred from military to civilian control. They hoped that this would ensure a major effort being put on peaceful, rather than military application of atomic energy. That the result of their efforts has not worked out as they had planned in no way detracts from the magnificent effort they made. A tangible result of these efforts was the formation of the Federation of American Scientists, a mass organisation of American scientists, which, in many important and topical statements, has warned against the consequences of development in nuclear weapon technology.

Many American scientists have been particularly outspoken in warning of the dangers of nuclear weapon development and testing. In June, 1957, the noted biochemist Pauling made public a warning signed by some two thousand American scientists which stated:

> Each nuclear bomb test spreads an added burden of radioactive elements over every part of the world. Each added amount of radiation causes damage to the health of human beings all over the world and causes damage to the pool of human germ plasm such as to lead to an increase in the number of seriously defective children that will be born in future generations.
>
> So long as these weapons are in the hands of only three powers an agreement for their control is feasible. If testing continues, and the possession of these weapons spreads to additional governments, the danger of outbreak of a cataclysmic nuclear war through the reckless action of some irresponsible national leader will be greatly increased.
>
> An international agreement to stop the testing of nuclear bombs now could serve as a first step toward a more general disarmament and the ultimate effective abolition of nuclear weapons, averting the possibility of a nuclear war that would be a catastrophe to all humanity.
>
> We have in common with our fellow men a deep concern for the welfare of all human beings. As scientists we have knowledge of the dangers involved and therefore a special responsibility to make these dangers known. We deem it imperative that immediate action be taken to effect an international agreement to stop the testing of all nuclear weapons.

This statement was taken up by scientists in many other countries; and by the end of last year some nine thousand fully qualified scientists from many countries had added their names to it. Last month a statement in similar terms, signed by 650 British scientists,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

including approximately 70 Fellows of the Royal Society, was forwarded to the Prime Minister. Indeed, many well-known British scientists are working actively to inform public opinion about the dangers of nuclear tests and of the atomic arms race in such movements as the Nuclear Disarmament Campaign, the scientists' group of the Society of Friends, or the Science for Peace Organisation; while the trade union of British scientists, the Association of Scientific Workers, has repeatedly stressed these dangers.

In other countries, too, scientists have been active in these matters. The Japanese scientists have done a magnificent job in carrying out systematic investigations of the after-effects of the radiation from the bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and of the effects of nuclear tests in poisoning with radioactive contamination the atmosphere and the soil of Japan and throughout the world. Their researches in this field which have been published by the Science Council of Japan in two thousand-page volumes provide a mine of factual information which has been of the greatest value in establishing the full consequences of nuclear test explosions.

Last year three hundred leading Japanese physicists jointly protested against the continued testing of nuclear weapons and addressed an appeal to British scientists to try to persuade the British government to stop the tests at Christmas Island.

In the Federal German Republic eighteen leading atomic physicists, after pointing to the dangers of strategic nuclear weapons, drew attention to the artificiality of the dividing line between so-called 'strategic' and 'tactical' weapons. 'Every single atom bomb or atomic shell has an effect similar to the first atom bomb which destroyed Hiroshima', they said, and went on to declare that: 'In any case none of the undersigned would be prepared to participate in the production, testing or use of atomic weapons in any way'. Their action, which made a tremendous impression, was immediately supported by a number of leading physicists from the German Democratic Republic.

In the U.S.S.R., too, many scientists have added their own appeals to the world-wide call for ending tests and for the abolition of nuclear weapons. From the Joint International Institute for Nuclear Research near Moscow—home of the world's largest accelerator of high energy nuclear particles—came a call signed by Professors Blokhintsev and Veksler and their leading colleagues, including scientists from China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania and Mongolia, which stated:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> We categorically pronounce ourselves in favour of banning atomic weapons and concluding an agreement among the countries as soon as possible on ending atomic and hydrogen bomb tests without delay, considering that any atomic war, wherever it may originate, would inexorably become a general atomic war, with dire consequences for mankind today.

Leading Soviet areologists, including Professor Engelhardt, said in a statement:

> We side with our foreign colleagues in their desire to protect people from the harmful effect of atomic explosion. In principle we stand for the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and insist on the need to ban the tests of these weapons as the first step in this direction.

In France some 1,172 scientists and others working at the nuclear centre at Soclay (the French Harwell) signed a declaration calling for the French government to take the initiative in trying to get other governments to cease the testing of nuclear weapons.

And so one could go on. Scientists from China, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, Denmark, Holland, India, Argentina, Australia and no doubt from many other countries have all warned about the dangers particularly of continued test explosions.

On an international scale also, many protests and warnings have come from scientists. In 1955 eighteen Nobel prize winners issued a warning from an international meeting at Lindau, while at about the same time the famous declaration signed by Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein, and eight others of the highest eminence was issued. This last declaration called for international meetings of scientists to discuss these matters. The first of these meetings was eventually held in Nova Scotia, in July, 1957, and issued a most important declaration on the perils of nuclear weapons at the end of its deliberations. This meeting was perhaps the most influential yet held for the discussion of these weapons; and the final statement was signed by twenty-two scientists of the highest eminence from ten different countries of east and west.

Many further examples of the stand scientists throughout the world have taken against nuclear weapons could be cited. For example the World Federation of Scientific Workers, the international federation of scientific bodies of the trade union type, has repeatedly urged that the use of nuclear weapons should be prohibited, their production and testing discontinued and existing stocks dismantled.

But sufficient has been said to show that very many scientists have thrown their energy and their knowledge into the campaign to rid mankind of the scourge of nuclear weapons.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# LABOUR DISCUSSION FORUM

AN UNUSUAL *Forum this month. One subject only—but that a key one. Letters for July by June 9 to The Editor, Labour Discussion Forum, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.*

**How Much is the Overseas Tribute?**

Whilst appreciating Hugo Rathbone's two-instalment article in the March and April issues I was somewhat puzzled by his calculation of British overseas investments. First, he quotes Professor Paish's conclusion in his study of Britain's Foreign Investments' (*Lloyds Bank Review*, July, 1956) that Britain's former £4,000 million overseas net assets had been converted in 1956 to a deficit of 'perhaps £1,000 million or more'. Yet the article then goes on to estimate that total British overseas investment now are about £4,000 million. Secondly, he gives £645 million as the total of overseas tribute, £115 million more from shipping, and another £150 million from banking and insurance. No official sources are quoted and it would be useful to know the basis of these calculations. As far as I know official estimates are less than one-quarter these totals.

'BRIXTON READER,'
*London, S.W.9.*

**It's a Most Important Question**

Behind the points 'Brixton Reader' raises there seems to be two important questions.

First, how is it, with an overall deficit of £1,000 millions or more in its overseas capital assets, that British capitalism has yet managed to build overseas investment up again from the postwar low level to which they had sunk so that they have reached the same, or even a higher nominal level than prewar? Of course, this figure of £4,000 million is really only equal to less than £2,000 million if account is taken of the fall in the value of sterling. Moreover, this rebuilding has only been made possible (as indeed Paish pointed out) by the credit obtained: (*a*) from the large expansion in sterling balances in London, particularly those held by the Colonies; and (*b*) from the frequent loans that Britain has been forced to get from the United States. From being still a creditor of the rest of the capitalist world before the war, Britain has now become a debtor, perpetually slithering to the brink of bankruptcy. The political implications of this position, especially as regards Britain's relations with the U.S. have long been obvious.

But from the fact that the overall debt to the U.S. is progressively increasing—and here comes the second important point—British capitalism is being forced to sell out some of its assets to America. These sales include not only assets in its Empire (and these are generally the most profitable there such as oil, uranium and other rights over now valuable minerals) but also increasing proportions of its assets here in Britain.

Now on the detailed points. First, my authority for giving £4.000 million as the present total of British overseas investment. This was contained in *The Sterling Area* (published in 1952) by A. R. Conan, economist to the Government's Commonwealth Economic Committee. In an Appendix Mr. Conan

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

presented a detailed calculation of all British foreign investments with commentaries for seven countries or regions. The actual total he reached, in a table summarising his concluclusions, was £4,200 millions for the period 1949-50. In a note to this table he stated that the figures were based on the then ruling 'current values' of the holdings, concluding that 'an estimate of approximately £4,000 millions for 1949-50 seems justified'. This figure is greater than that periodically given by the Bank of England's *Survey*: but these are based on the nominal value, not the current or market price. (Let us suppose the nominal value of the capital of an overseas company, completely British controlled, with 100,000 £1 shares is £100,000. The market price on the Stock Exchange of these £1 shares may be 40s. The 'current value' of the whole holding would then be £200,000.)

In my opinion these current values are now more important on which to base one's calculations of the total of investments. As Paish pointed out, 75 per cent of the total of all overseas investments in 1956 were in shares of overseas companies in comparison with the position in 1938, when some 43 per cent of their total, as Conan says (p. 179) was in public debt. Again, current practice, especially amongst the larger companies, is to hold very big undistributed profits in reserve, thus making the nominal value of their shares of less significance than formerly. Indeed, there is considerable support developing in British financial circles for adopting the almost universal American practice of issuing company shares at what is called no par value, *i.e.* at prices related to those ruling for such shares on the Stock Exchange at the time of issue, instead of at nominal value.

Of course, if the present recession becomes a world-wide slump, a revision of such an estimate would be needed, as much of the reserves of these undistributed profits would have to go to meet losses in profits, and so lead to a fall in the market value of the holdings; but so far there is not much indication of this.

Conan's estimate was correct for the period 1949-50. Since then there has been a considerable increase in Britain's foreign investments. For the years 1951-57 inclusive, F. W. Paish gave a table showing that this increase was some £500 millions. (*Financial Times*, January 1, 1958.) So actually the present level of British overseas investments should be £4,700 millions rather than £4,000 million, which I used as being well within the actual total. It would also have taken into account the fall in values that had taken place since the present recession started.

Next, my authorities for the figure of £1,000 million as the total of the tribute drawn by British capitalism from the peoples of the rest of the world. The first figure mentioned of £645 million is the total of two items given in the Government's most recent Balance of Payments White Paper (Cmnd. 273, p. 5, October, 1957). Under the 'credits' section one item is called 'Interest, profits and dividends', amounting to £357 millions. An explanatory note (p. 25) says this includes 'some profits retained overseas for re-investment'. To this I added a second item called 'Other (net)' in the same section, amounting to £288 millions. This item, the White Paper states, includes 'all the overseas transactions of U.K. oil companies . . . insurance, civil aviation, films, royalties, commissions, banking and other services': also 'sales of gold at home for industrial use and an allowance for profits

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accruing from abroad to U.K. merchants' (p. 25). As neither item included the profits of British-owned shipping, I have calculated their net earnings by subtracting from the total earned by British-owned shipping the amount paid out by British shippers to shipping owned overseas. These were given by the White Paper as 'credits': £519 millions less 'debits', £404 millions, *i.e.* a net credit of £115 million. This makes a total of £760 million of tribute; all, be it noted, received direct from overseas.

But, as the controversy following on last autumn's crisis served to reveal among many other interesting facts, to this figure of £760 millions further sums should be added to get a complete picture of the tribute levied by British capitalism. They were based on figures given in a broadcast by John Wood, member of the staff of a city merchant bank. (*The Listener* November 28, 1957.) He was controverting a previous broadcast by A. C. L. Day, Reader in the University of London, minimising the value of the earnings here in the City from world trade and finance. The figure mentioned of £150 millions, Mr. Wood itemised as follows: net foreign exchange earnings on the insurance market, £40 million; London's earning as a merchanting centre, *i.e.* on the commodity markets and in the buying and selling of produce and raw material, £30 million; shipping commission and brokerage on the Baltic exchange, £20 million; fees and commissions for arranging long, medium and short-term loans and credits on the capital market, £10 million; general banking services in connection with investments from overseas in London, foreign exchange dealings, etc., £10 million; finally, the cost of money which overseas dealers paid for all sorts of export finance, £40 million. This adds up to the £150 millions, which Mr. Wood called the total of 'the City's net overseas earnings'. It is larger than that given by Nigel Birch when Economic Secretary to the Treasury, in answer to a House of Commons question on December 19 last. Wood had estimated shipping brokerage at £10 million less than Birch, but he had put banking services at £35 million more. Accordingly, if we take account of both these estimates of the total of the City's earnings, we get a grand total of between £885-£910 millions for this tribute.

But even to this total there should still be added some figure of the extra or super profit made by British capitalism out of its dealings with countries whose economy is at a lower level of technique. Though difficult to calculate it must reach a very considerable sum indeed. I, therefore, consider that 'close on £1,000 million' is a reasonable estimate of the grand total of the figure accruing to the profit in one form or another of: (*a*) U.K. *holders* of shares and bonds in companies; (*b*) U.K. *holders* of government or other public loans in overseas countries; and (*c*) U.K. *partners* in business concerns dealing with British overseas interests. I emphasise these words holder or partners as it is precisely for the profit of these *individuals,* of these individuals *alone,* who go to make up the hierarchy of British monopoly capitalism, that the whole gigantic system of imperialist exploitation exists, and all that this implies for the continuous decay and distortion of British economy, paralleled by the increasing misery of those exploited overseas.

HUGO RATHBONE,

*Highgate.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# AN ELECTION PEN-PICTURE

Councillor Tommy Richardson

[*In the local elections which took place in Britain during the past month some interesting trends may be noted. Firstly, they have shown significant Tory defeats. Next, there has been quite an important measure of Labour gains, which have rather more than recovered the losses of recent years, and ensured Labour control extending to other councils. Finally, amongst some new features have been the increase in the vote where Communist candidates have contested, and their gain of eleven seats. Ten other seats having been retained and three lost, this means that in all twenty-one seats were won; a net gain of eight. One of these was in the urban district of Houghton-le-Spring, in the Durham coalfield. Here for the last nine years every councillor has been Labour and there has been a Labour majority for over forty years. One Communist candidate, a miner until his war injuries led to total disability, tied for sixth place in an eight-seat ward. We have pleasure in printing Councillor Tommy Richardson's comments on the election, which is illustrative of this trend.—Ed.*, L.M.]

THE main reason I was elected is because the people want united socialist action against the Tory Government and their anti-working class policy, which is becoming more and more apparent in the Durham coalfield, in pre-war years a distressed area.

I have lived here all my life. I first became a councillor in 1936 but lost my seat nine years ago, in 1949. To be again elected as a Communist councillor is a worthy victory for our Party and for the policy that has been pursued during the nine years our Party was unrepresented upon the council. During the thirteen years when I served upon the council, all my fellow councillors were Labour. Once again, excepting for myself, the council is composed of Labour councillors only. This election has proved that Labour men and women are ready to support a Communist candidate when offered a real socialist policy backed by continuous day-to-day work on their behalf.

When I was defeated in 1949, and again in 1952 and 1955, it did not mean that the day-to-day work amongst the people ceased, and that our Party presented itself at election time only. Each time I announced publicly that though defeated the Communist candidate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would always be ready, as he had been in the past, to give guidance upon such matters as rent questions, housing repairs, pensions, statutory assistance, unemployment benefit; and that I would still carry on the job of being claimant's representative at tribunals, Courts of Referees, and so on. This I did, of course, not only for those who voted for me but also for those who did not. This voluntary work I have been doing since 1934, and it means I have been dealing with an average of 300 cases each year. Because of my letters to the press, applicants some miles away from my home town have sought my help. Consistent work has been successful in gaining increases in allowances for hundreds of cases receiving National Assistance, besides many others. Most Labour candidates when they are defeated retire into inactivity, unfortunately; the people they were seeking to represent see them no more.

Never at any time have I taken a negative attitude about the Communist Party; and when it was attacked because of events in Korea or Hungary, I expounded our policy in argument and in letters to the press in a positive way. The outcome was that I did not meet with any vehement antagonism from the people. My week-end sale of fifty-five *Daily Workers* has also proved valuable in helping me to keep in touch with the people in my ward, and helps me to approach them with 'party' politics, which I have always maintained is a pre-requisite to getting to understand one's electors. The day-to-day work which must be carried on between elections is the thing that wins elections. Not only does it gain concessions; it also wins support for the policy of our Party and weakens the attack of our enemies.

During the election campaign, I argued that to smash the Tories, a real alternative working class policy is needed. The big issue is whether the local Council should tamely submit to the Tory attacks on the social and welfare services or resist them. For example: in 1946 the government of the day allowed local authorities to make increases to meet the contribution to their housing revenue account. Unlike some Labour councils Houghton-le-Spring fell for the Tory argument and raised all council rents accordingly. Today many Labour councillors give way to the Tories on the grounds that nothing can be done against them. I reject this cowardly and defeatist view. The people do not elect working-class candidates to do the Tories' dirty work for them. It is the policy of the Communist Party to work for united action by Labour men and Communists, inside and outside the councils, to defeat Tory policy. Councils should join with tenants in resisting the government. If

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only some of the Labour councils made a challenge, the government's position could be made untenable.

I was elected with a vote of 1,482 (82 per cent of the top Labour vote). It was 117 higher than the lowest defeated Labour candidate. In 1952 my vote of 1,187 was 500 lower than the lowest successful Labour vote. In 1955 at 1,274, mine was 160 below the lowest successful Labour man.

The result of this election has proved that Communism is not the bogey that Tories, Right-wingers and reactionaries would have the people believe. It has proved that the people want a change.

---

*LABOUR MONTHLY* TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

## THEY MET AMONG THE FOSSILS

International Regulation of output is one of the points on the agenda of the Conference, but in view of the fact as *The Times* of April 4 admitted that 'there are so many conflicting interests and so many divergent views,' the Conference 'must confine its attention to matters on which concerted action is not only desirable but also practicable'.

International organised capitalism may be 'desirable', but it is an unattainable aim. What is 'practicable' is temporary truces, empty declarations behind the screen of which manœuvres go on, to try and reduce the opponents' output, to filch the opponents' trade, to secure the opponents' market, to undercut the opponents' production.

Just because organised restriction of output on an international scale is not attainable so controlled inflation leading to higher wholesale prices is also not attainable. Inflation, yes, that will raise prices, but that involves the danger of losing all control. Controlled inflation is indeed a contradiction in terms. Higher prices at home but at the expense of dumping abroad involving new falls in international prices, but as dumping is competitive it means the breakdown of all international monetary standards.

From *The World Economic Conference* by H. Rathbone, June, 1933.
(The Conference met in the London Geological Museum.)

---


## *REVISED ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES*

*OVERSEAS (post-free):*

*Second class mail (unsealed envelope)*

| | |
|---|---|
| *Canada and U.S.A.* | $3.00 |
| *Elsewhere* | £1 |

*First class mail (sealed envelope)*

| | |
|---|---|
| *Canada* | $3.50 |
| *Other Commonwealth countries* | £1 4s. 0d. |
| *U.S.A.* | $4.50 |
| *Other non-Commonwealth countries* | £1 12s. 0d. |

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.


PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*(Continued from page ii of cover)*

improvements, the policy of the National Coal Board. After twelve years they were becoming aware that nationalisation is 'not enough', that it is not 'an instalment of socialism'. One retired miner, with a long and highly respected record as a trade unionist, told me bitterly: 'I fought since I was a young man against the coal-owners and for nationalisation. D'you think I am willing to see it wrecked now? Ruined by deliberate waste of money, whilst wage demands and pensions are refused?' He asked why no real attack was being made on lavish appointments at high salaries of officials 'who never see a coal mine until their first visit after they get the job'? He thought L.M. should expose nominees put in to watch the interests of Big Business. He added: 'Today some miners' leaders seem to have forgotten that attack is always the spear of progress. They shouldn't need a Cousins to show them the way.' Well! to that one can only answer that the strength of a union lies in the men in the coalfield themselves. And to them we may well say, in the words of a song written by a Durham miner:

*'Long may the Union flourish still*
*On Tees and Wear and Tyne'*

What a stronghold of real Socialism these sturdy fighters will make the North-East coast—and in the not so distant future.

I cannot resist passing on the story of a London reader, who gave a lift to a well-dressed woman during the bus strike. As they parted, our reader handed her a union leaflet, explaining that the public should not blame the busmen. The passenger replied: 'O I don't blame *the busmen;* I only blame *the union.* If enough busmen would only stand firm together, and get *organised,* they could defy their union *any day!*' She is sister under the same class skin to the well-briefed Tory canvasser who, when the rails settlement was announced, snapped her elegant fingers, exclaiming: 'Now we can break all these unions—like *that*!'

The Tory-made 'pockets of unemployment' are beginning to affect our Fund pocket. Merseyside, Belfast, Scotland and parts of the Midlands are feeling the draught, for example. We know readers have many calls on the purse, being active people. But what of those who 'keep meaning to', but never quite do? I hope they will follow the example of a 'regular' who found the May number so good that he trebled his gift to express his 'increased appreciation'.

April donations totalled:

# £31 1s. 11d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s; C.T.M., 'Mill Hill', 11s 6d; B. Ainley, 5s; H.G.B., 3s; Olivia Greene, £2; G. E. Hoyal, 2s 6d; L. Perkins, 5s; D. M. Clarke, 10s; J. A. Smith 5s; E. Strachan Rogers, £1 1s; R. McLeod, 5s; Cambridge Seniors, £1; O.A.P., 'Notts', 10s; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 6s; 'Republican', 5s; Oliver Twist and Friends, 9s 6d; H. Tinkler, 5s; D. Smith, 5s; Royston Green, 3s 6d; J. Tarver, 10s; L. Bates, 3s 4d; S. Mill, £1; 'L'Humanité', 3s; E.J.B., 10s; Socialist Sailor, £1; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s; A Highgate Reader, £3; 'Esperanto' (pre-paid); 'British Columbia', 15s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS INCLUDE: H. E. Walthall, 2s; D. H. Calcutt 7s; K. B. Forge, 10s; E. M. Berlyn, 5s; J. Stein, 6s; J. Clarke, 5s; R. M. Lang, 12s; K. B. Kay, £1 4s 3d; J.A.S. (Canada), 15s 3d; G. Darby, 10s; A.S. (Canada), £1 2s; F.C., 'Salford', 5s; N. Hamlin, 2s; M. Walsh, 3s; A. Opulski, 5s; M. Hill, 7s; W. G. Greenslade, 2s 6d; F. Wignall, 1s; J. Smith, 3s; S. Craven, 10s; H.A. (U.S.A.), £2 8s 11d; Anon (Canada), 14s 6d; H.B. (U.S.A.), £2 16s 2d; 'Armenian-Persian', £1.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT,

Co-op. No. L.99482.

134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope. For overseas rates, see page 288) for year's subscription from the..... issue.

(SIGNED) .....

**To LABOUR MONTHLY**
**134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3**

# Labour Monthly Bound Volume 1957

*It's a history of the year and a permanent record*

**ORDER NOW**

From your usual newsagents, price £1 5s. 0d., or send 10s. 6d., plus 1s. 6d., postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

**THE MANAGER,**
**134 BALLARDS LANE,**
**LONDON, N.3.**

## LABOUR RESEARCH

**June issue includes:**
**'Who Controls the Police?'**
**'Shipbuilding in the Recession'**
**'Brooke's Retreat'**

**Monthly 9d.; p.a. 10s. 6d.**

**LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT**
**2, Soho Square, London, W.1**

## NATIONAL GUARDIAN

**10th Year of Publication**

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by JAMES ARONSON

*Annual Subscription 35s.*

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1

## FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy of the.....issue to:-

(1) Name .....
Address .....

(2) Name .....
Address .....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed .....
Address .....
.....

**TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3**


PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED